



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

also, that he has been *assured that all the scroll-border scarabs come from Abydos*. This is extremely curious, if true, seeing that these little objects form almost the only continuous monumental links between the VI and XI dynasties. To him is due the discovery of "double-reading" scarabs; *i. e.*, of scarabs inscribed with hieroglyphic anagrams composed of two names having one or more signs in common. Of these, and of the re-issues of scarabs inscribed with the names of earlier kings but produced under later reigns, Mr. Petrie gives some useful examples.

Enough has been said to show that *Historical Scarabs* is invaluable as a standard of comparison, and as a guide to the study of a very fascinating branch of Egyptian archaeology. One has but to note the confusion which reigns in the scarab-cases of most provincial museums at home and abroad to estimate its value to curators.

It is impossible to say too much in praise of the exquisite skill with which Mr. Petrie has drawn these 2,220 scarabs, reproducing every beauty, every blemish, and even every fracture as it stands. Photography could not render them more faithfully. Each is given of exactly the size of the original, and to each is appended a brief indication of its material and color.—AMELIA B. EDWARDS, in *Academy*, July 19.

S. ROCHEBLAVE. *Essai sur le Comte de Caylus*. L'Homme—L'Artiste—L'Antiquaire. 8vo, pp. xv, 384. Paris, 1889; Hachette.

German writers, like Stark (*Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst*), have long since recognized the important position held by the Comte de Caylus in the renaissance of archæologic study, but this work is the first attempt to place before us the interesting personality of the many-sided man who was in various ways Winckelmann's predecessor, and whose methods are thought by some to be "almost more in conformity with the general currents of modern science than the inspiration and eye of genius of a Winckelmann" (Stark, p. 366).

Caylus was born in 1692 and died in 1765, the year after Winckelmann published his *Histoire de l'Art*, the year before his *Monumenti antichii inediti*. He served brilliantly in the army in his early youth, and when peace brought his career to an abrupt close he travelled in Italy and through the east. Shortly after 1730, having settled in Paris, he began his activity as an artist. He became the promoter of the *Académie Royale*, shortly after 1731, when it elected him a member, and was soon recognized as the protector and educator of promising artists. By his desire to assist in the renovation of art, he was led to the study of ancient art first from a technical and then from an artistic standpoint. In 1742, when he was elected to the *Académie des Inscriptions*, he commenced to study antiquity as an antiquarian, and, beginning in 1749, he read before the society more than fifty memoirs. In the meantime, he had become

the greatest collector of his age, having his agents all over Europe and even in the East, and he was thus led to concentrate his archæological endeavors on the publication of a *Recueil d'Antiquités*,¹ of which seven volumes were issued between 1752 and 1767, the materials for which were furnished mainly from his own collections. His skill and facility as an engraver and etcher (for he executed over three thousand pieces) was of great use to him in this work and enabled him to secure, in a greater degree than had ever been done before, the exactitude of reproduction that was his principal aim, while the breadth, boldness and character of his style were in happy contrast to the mannered affectation of his time, and by his example as well as his precept he popularized the great old masters. But it is as an archæologist that he comes before us in a peculiarly interesting aspect. Before him there had been only pseudo-erudite antiquarians, without general or systematic knowledge, incapable of pronouncing either on the age, genuineness, or style of a work of art, or of understanding the place of art and archæology in civilization. Caylus presided over the revival of the study of antiquity by archæology and of the study of art by antiquity: he stood at the source of what proved to be a double stream which became divided as early as Winckelmann, who was the founder of the æsthetic as Müller was of the archæologic school. Caylus was an empiricist, and he began his study on the side of technique for purposes of the practical application of ancient methods to modern art. His insatiable curiosity, his indomitable perseverance, his versatility, enabled him to penetrate far into technical secrets. His most noteworthy feat was the rediscovery of the process of encaustic-painting in 1754. In this branch of his *Histoire*, it is quite clear that Winckelmann owes nearly all to Caylus. The same tendencies led him to investigate the origins of art; and in this study of archaïsism, wherever he found it, Caylus had no rivals for more than a half-century. It would naturally be supposed that this would lead him to specialize in the field of the history of art. But here we meet with his dislike of generalizations, his materialism, his love of dissecting rather than constructing: the hand, not the mind, was his subject. And yet we discover, here and there, traces of a theory of the history of art that is interesting as preceding and differing radically from Winckelmann's. With Caylus, art was subject to certain general laws of development, wherever it was, and the arts of different countries were interrelated. In contrast with this is Winckelmann's well-known theory of the spontaneous, independent indigenous character of the art of every people. For Caylus, therefore, the arts of the Egyptians, Phœnicians, and Etruscans were important both in themselves and for their relation to Greek art; whereas Winckelmann treats them in a perfunctory manner and hastens

¹ *Recueil d'Antiquités égyptiennes, étrusques, grecques, et romaines*, the words *et gauloises* being added with the third volume.

to Greek art, over which he will tolerate no external influence. But, while Caylus may be considered to have had a keener historic sense from the archæologic point of view, he was utterly wanting in æsthetic sense. He had no appreciation of the beauty of a work of art: beauty irritated him: he wished to have his curiosity aroused, to be convicted of an ignorance which he must attempt to overcome, to meet with an obscurity upon which he could throw light, to reäpplly some ancient and long-disused method. Nothing was too ugly or too insignificant for him. He quickly passed from technical points to questions of interpretation, and here, also, he is the pioneer of the modern school; for example, in the study of figured vases, the application of mythology to art, and the ability to reconstruct a lost style from a single insignificant figure. Such was his divination of the art of the Ancient Empire in Egypt, a period of expansion and freedom which preceded that of immobility. Such also was his assertion of the Greek origin of a large class of the so-called Etruscan vases. The scrupulous exactitude of his descriptions (entirely new in this field of work) very likely served as models to Winckelmann, than whom he may be said to be more thoroughly scientific on a much lower plane. Caylus lacked idealism, enthusiasm, artistic sense: therefore he made but little impression as an archæologist; while Winckelmann carried all before him. But Caylus was an invaluable guide for the unwary, a model for specialists. Therefore, while the public did not know much of him in this capacity—but revere him as a patron of art—his memory has lived among students as their first and greatest trainer; the precursor, if not the founder, of a science with a distinct object, a well-defined critical apparatus, a consistent method, an organic life—even though it be painfully limited in its sphere, and more useful as an instrument than as an end. Caylus and Winckelmann together form a complete whole, each supplementing the other.

This is a summary of a novel and interesting memoir, written with keen appreciation and in a good style.—A. L. F., JR.

GUSTAVE SCHLUMBERGER. *Un empereur byzantin au dixième siècle: Nicéphore Phocas*. 4to, pp. iv, 781. Paris, 1890; Firmin Didot.

With one exception this is the longest monograph devoted to any of the Byzantine emperors. It is written by a scholar who has made for fifteen years a specialty of Byzantine history, and who has created the special branch of Byzantine sigillography. The book is not merely a recital of military actions and diplomatic negotiations, but is a summary of the military, social and political life of Constantinople toward the year 960, illustrated by descriptive geography, archæology, and numismatics. The figure of Nikephoros, strong, brave and pitiless, with a peculiar combination of asceticism and love of adventure, is made to stand out with clear-